

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.asplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 08/977,846 | 11/25/1997 | JOHN O. RYAN | Q116830 | 3572 |
| 22373 7590 08062612 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 1100 PENNSYL VANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | BORISSOV, IGOR N | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3628 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/06/2012 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@sughrue.com sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. 08/977,846 | Applicant(s) RYAN, JOHN O. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Examiner IGOR BORISSOV | Art Unit 3628 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

| THE REPLY FILED 25 July 2012 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION NO NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED | N IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. |
|--|---|
| The reply was filed after a final rejection. No Notice of Appeal has beer one of the following replies; (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evide. | |
| (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41. | 31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with a not permitted in design applications. The reply must be filed within one of |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of | the final rejection. |
| The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisor In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later | ry Action; or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. |
| within 2 months of the mailing date of the final rejection. The curre the prior Advisory Action or SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a), (b FIRST RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S FIRST AFTER-FINA | I the final rejection, whichever is earlier.) or (c). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THIS ADVISORY ACTION IS THE AL REPLY WHICH WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL TUATION SET FORTH UNDER BOX (c). See MPEP 706.07(f). In which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate |
| extension fee made even med a fee date for purposes or determining me appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) th set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) or (c) above, if check mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any ear NOTICE OF APPEAL | e expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally ked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance wi Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 C Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time perio | CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of |
| AMENDMENTS | |
| The proposed amendments filed after a final rejection, but prior to They raise new issues that would require further consideration | |
| a) I hely raise new issues that would require further consideration b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | on and/or search (see NOTE below); |
| c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or | for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for |
| d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding | anding number of finally rejected claims. |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See a | attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if allowable claim(s). | |
| For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): (a) will remove or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appearance. | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after final action, but before or or other evidence. | on the date of Cline - Nation of Association with not be entered because |
| | s why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing the Notic because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejec and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier pres | tions under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the st REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | tatus of the claims after entry is below or attached. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NO <u>See continuation.</u> | DT place the application in condition for allowance because: |
| Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/ 13. ☐ Other: TATUS OF CLAIMS | 08) Paper No(s) |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1,33-64,91 and 92. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 65-90. | |
| | /IGOR BORISSOV/ |
| | Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628 |

Continuation of 11.

In response to Applicant's argument that the prior art of record fails to disclose a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if

the data is the alphanumeric data, and a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier, it is noted that Yoshio explicitly teaches the use of voice synthesizing technique at page 26, lines 16-19, and De Bey disclose system shiftly to process either digital or analog information signals (page. 9, L. 10-11; page 19, L. 32-33), wherein microprocessor based controller 52 provides switching function (controls the flow of data and the video processing within the receiver 40) (Fig. 2; page 11, L. 1-17). As per "audio amplifier" feature per se, De Bey discloses a speech producing sub-system outpied to the controller and the memory for converting the selected data from digital form to an analog signal, (page 8, line 4), wherein receiving, processing and viewing broadcasted TV program, including visual and audible information, suggests the use of an audio amplifier (page 1, lines 15-16).

In response to Applicant's argument that the prior art of record fails to disclose that a processor fails to provide the user interface with a set of menus describing the database, and accepts selections from the set of menus, it is noted that Yoshio teaches a tuner for receiving a broadcast signal, a memory coupled to the tuner for storing data in the received broadcast signal in a database, a user interface for providing a set of menus describing the database, and for accepting selections from the set of menus, see page 25, [0009] line 5; [0010] line 5; [0011] in [1012]

The remaining Applicant's arguments essentially repeat the arguments presented above; therefore, the responses presented by the Examiner above are equally applicable to the remaining applicant's arguments.